

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 25-35 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended herein. No new claims have been added. As a result claims 1-6 and 25-35 are pending for examination, with claims 1 and 6 being independent claims.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to further clarify the manner in which items of a customized user interface communicate with a universal print driver by accessing respective first objects to which respective second objects are linked. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 is provided, for example, at paragraphs [0030] through [0033] of Applicant's published application (US 2005/0185211 A1), hereinafter, "the published application" as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

1. The Rejection of Claims 1-6

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,831,752 to Matsuo (hereinafter "Matsuo") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0015842 to Nanivadekar et al. (hereinafter Nanivadekar). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

At page 5, the Office Action acknowledges that Matsuo does not expressly disclose steps of linking a first identifier of each respective first object of the first plurality of first objects to a second identifier of each respective second object of the second plurality of second objects through a software interface, hiding each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure from view of a user, displaying only the customized user interface while hiding the standard user interface from the view of the user, and enabling access as previously recited in claims 1 and 6. However, the Office Action asserts that Nanivadekar discloses each of these aspects, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine these aspects allegedly disclosed by Nanivadekar with the system of Matsuo because both references are from similar fields of endeavor, and doing so would provide user interface screens that are configured correctly for any display device and allow a user to view only the items he/she desires thereby increasing efficiency and overall usability. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, Nanivadekar does not teach or suggest a step of setting a parameter of each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure to a value that hides each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure from view of a user as recited in each of claims 1 and 6. Indeed, as shown in Fig. 3 of Nanivadekar, the original standard user interface (on the legacy host system such as an IBM model 390 system, a Digital Equipment Corporation VAX system, or other legacy systems from Sperry-Univac or Wang) is not hidden from the view of the user but is still present and visible. (See Fig. 3 and paragraph [0055].)

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Nanivadekar with the system of Matsuo (for the reason asserted or for any other reason) because there is simply no need to do so. Matsuo is directed to a printer driver and associated standardized graphical user interface that can be customized and the customized settings saved on a per user basis. Both the standardized graphical user interface and the asserted customized user interface of Matsuo are graphical user interfaces on the same computer system. This is in contrast to Nanivadekar which is directed to creating a symbiotic computer application that permits a customized graphical user interface on one device to be linked to an asynchronous text-based legacy application executed on a different legacy host device. (See paragraph [0001] and paragraphs [0034]-[0036]).

Moreover, even if one skilled in the art were to combine the asserted teachings of Nanivadekar with the system of Matsuo, Applicant's claimed invention would still distinguish thereover. Specifically, nowhere does the asserted combination of Matsuo and Nanivadekar teach or suggest a method of customizing a standard user interface associated with a universal printer driver that includes a step of associating each item of a first plurality of items of a standard user interface data structure with a respective first object of a first plurality of first objects, where each first object of the first plurality of first objects communicates with the universal printer driver as recited in each of claims 1 and 6 as amended. Nor does the asserted combination of Matsuo and Nanivadekar teach or suggest a step of enabling each item of the second plurality of items to communicate with the universal printer driver through the customized user interface by accessing each respective first object of the first plurality of first objects through the respective second object to which it is linked. And, as discussed above, neither Matsuo, Nanivadekar, nor their asserted combination teaches or suggests a step of setting

a parameter of each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure to a value that hides each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure from view of a user as recited in each of claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, for at least the above noted reasons, claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish over the asserted combination of Matsuo and Nanivadekar and the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable thereover should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and patentably distinguish over the asserted combination of Matsuo and Nanivadekar for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combination of Matsuo and Nanivadekar be withdrawn.

2. The Rejection of Claims 25-35

Claims 25-26 and 28-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combination of Matsuo and Nanivadekar as applied to claims 1- 6, and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0163660 to Iwai (hereinafter Iwai) and U.S. Patent No. 7,053,895 to Yamagata et al (hereinafter Yamagata). Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combination of Matsuo, Nanivadekar, Iwai, and Yamagata as applied to claim 26, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,818 to Ratnaker et al. (hereinafter Ratnaker).

Applicant does not concede that the proposed combination of Matsuo, Nanivadekar, Iwai, and Yamagata, and the proposed combination of Matsuo, Nanivadekar, Iwai, Yamagata, and Ratnaker are proper, and reserves the right to further traverse the propriety of those combinations in the future. However, even in combination, the asserted combination of Matsuo, Nanivadekar, Iwai, and Yamagata, and the asserted combination of Matsuo, Nanivadekar, Iwai, Yamagata, and Ratnaker fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 1 and 6 from which each of claims 25-35 depend. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 25-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combinations of Matsuo, Nanivadekar Iwai, Yamagata, and Ratnaker is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, or authorization to charge a deposit account submitted herewith, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,

Oliver H. Foehr et al., Applicant

By: /Robert A. Skrivaneck, Jr./
Robert A. Skrivaneck Jr., Reg. No. 41,316
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
United States of America
Telephone: 617-395-7000
Facsimile: 617-395-7070

Docket No.: Z2002-702319

Date: April 16, 2010